IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.4866 OF 2005

Ashok Kumar Jain ..Applicant

Vs.

Shri.D.B.Batki & Anr. ..Respondents

...

L.A.Ruben i/b D.H.Petit and Co.
Advocate for Applicant
Mr.B.H.Mehta A.P.P. for the State

...

CORAM: SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.

DATE : OCTOBER 14, 2005

P.C.

1. Heard the learned advocate for the applicant and the learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The applicant is seeking quashing of process issued by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 29th Court, Dadar, Mumbai in C.C.No.19/SF/2003. In the said case process was issued against the applicant under Clauses 3 and 5 of Schedule VII of Rule 57 of

the Maharashtra Factories Rules, 1963.

3. For the reasons recorded in the decision of this Court in the case of **V.K.Jain and others Vs. Pratap V. Padode reported in 2005(3) Mh.L.J.778,** I am of the opinion that the applicant has an efficacious remedy of preferring revision against the order of Magistrate issuing process. Hence, in my view, it would be appropriate that the applicant prefers a revision before the concerned Sessions Court against the order of the Magistrate issuing process.

4. Liberty is granted to the applicant to prefer the necessary revision before the concerned Sessions Court. The learned advocate for the applicant makes a statement that the necessary revision will be preferred within four weeks from today. In view of this statement, the trial Court shall not proceed with the trial for a period of four weeks.

5. On the necessary revision being preferred by the applicant before the concerned Sessions Court,

the concerned Sessions Court shall dispose of the matter on merits after hearing the necessary parties.

6. Criminal Application is disposed of.

7. Authenticated copy be issued to the parties.

[V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.]